

**In the Drawings:**

Please accept replacement drawings 1 and 2A-2B attached herein.

## REMARKS

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action mailed May 3, 2005. Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1-23 have been rejected. Claims 2, 4, 8, and 10-11 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 14, 15, 18-23 have been amended. New claim 24 has been added. No new matter has been added with these amendments to the claims. Reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

### Drawings:

As suggested by the Examiner, Figures 1, 2A and 2B have been amended. Replacement sheets are included with this response.

### Claim Objections:

Claim 14 has been amended, as suggested by the Examiner, by removing “)”.

### § 112 Rejections:

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-23 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 2, 4, 8, and 10-11 have been cancelled without prejudice. Thus, the rejections with respect to these claims are moot. In addition, claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 14, 15, 18-23 have been amended to comport with the Examiner’s suggestions by further clarify the claimed subject matter and to correct errors associated with insufficient element antecedent basis.

### Double Patenting:

Claims 1-2, 5 and 12-13 have been rejected by the Examiner based on non-statutory double patenting in view of claims 1-4 and 20-26 of US 6,605,834 and/or in view of claims 1-7 of US 6,514,891. A terminal disclaimer for these issued patents has been herein attached to this amendment for overcoming this rejection, pursuant to 37 CFR 1.130(b). The two patents and the present invention are commonly owned by LG Electronics.

## § 102 Rejections

As suggested by the Examiner, phrases such as “plasma display panel”, “a dielectric of the PDP” have been incorporated as structural elements to the pending claims. Furthermore, claim 1 has been amended to recite, in part, “a phosphor layer which comprises a ferroelectric transparent ceramics material, wherein the phosphor layer is a mixture of a ferroelectric transparent ceramics powder and a phosphor powder.”

Claims 1-5, 10, and 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Masaru et al.. (GB-2023567). Claims 2, 4, and 10 have been cancelled without prejudice so the rejection with respect to these claims is moot.

Massaru merely teaches providing a transparent ferroelectric ceramic material (pg. 2, l2) but fails to teach, “a phosphor layer which comprises a ferroelectric transparent ceramics material . . . a mixture of a ferroelectric transparent ceramics powder and a phosphor powder” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, amended claim 1 is distinguishable over Masaru, et al. under section 102(b). Since Masaru does not anticipate all elements of claim 1, as amended, then claim 1 should be in condition for allowance.

Claims 3, 5-7, 9, 12-14 and 24 are dependent on claim 1 and at least include all the limitations of the independent base claim. As such, claims 3, 5-7, 9, 12-14 and 24 should be also allowable by the virtue of their dependence on amended claim 1.

Claims 1-2, 4-7, and 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Auciello et al. (US 5,453,661). Claims 2, 4, and 10-11 have been cancelled without prejudice so the rejection with respect to these claims is moot.

Auciello merely teaches, “the phosphor layer . . . placed directly on the thin film ferroelectric layer . . . [wherein] the phosphor layer . . . [is] spaced apart from the thin film ferroelectric layer.” (see Auciello, col. 2, lines 55-63)

Auciello does not teach or suggest a phosphor layer being a mixture of ferroelectric transparent ceramics powder and a phosphor power. Therefore, amended claim 1 is distinguishable over Auciello under section 102. Since Auciello does not teach all the elements of claim 1, as amended, it does not anticipate claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims, noted above, should be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Satoh et al. (US 5,757,061). Claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice, so the rejection with respect to claim 4 is moot.

Satoh discloses ferroelectric material made of Bi<sub>4</sub>Ti<sub>3</sub>O<sub>12</sub> and SrTiO<sub>3</sub> (see Satoh, col. 11, ll. 15-30). However, Satoh does not teach or suggest the elements of amended claim 1 “wherein the phosphor layer is a mixture of a ferroelectric transparent ceramics power and a phosphor powder.” Thus, claim 1 as amended is distinguishable over Satoh, as well as allowable along with it dependent claims.

Claims 1 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Karam et al. (US 5,309,071). Claim 8 has been cancelled without prejudice so the rejection with respect to this claim is moot.

Karam teaches “manganese-containing species to form a very thin . . . manganese-activated zinc sulfide phosphor coating on the surfaces of the particles of the ferroelectric material.” (see Karam, col. 4, ll. 45-50) Karam et al. fails to teach “the phosphor layer is a mixture of a ferroelectric transparent ceramics powder and a phosphor powder.” Therefore, claim 1 as amended is distinguishable over Karam et al. and allowable along with claims 3, 5-7, 9, 12-14 and 24, depending therefrom.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the recognition of allowable subject matter in claims 9 and 14-23, if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, set forth in the Office Action and to include all the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

All claims have been carefully reviewed to correct lack of antecedent basis and any other formalities. Claim 1 has been amended to substantially incorporate all elements of claim 9, and for the reasons provided above is distinguishable from the cited references and is therefore in condition for allowance, along with its dependent claims.

Independent claim 15 substantially incorporates all the elements of claim 1 and is therefore distinguishable over the cited references and in condition for allowance. Claims 16-23 should be also in condition for allowance by the virtue of being dependent on an allowable base claim.

## CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the present amendment places claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9 and 12-24 of the present application in condition for allowance.

Applicant has reviewed the cited references and believes that the claims of the present invention are allowable over the cited references individually or in combination with the other cited references. No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Date: August 3, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA

By:



Lew Edward V. Macapagal  
Registration No. 55,416  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Customer No. 035884

801 S. Figueroa Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Telephone: 213-623-2221  
Facsimile: 213-623-2211